



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,584	09/08/2003	Joerg Beringer	09282.0010-00000	1932
60668 7590 02/28/2011 SAP / FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				
EXAMINER JAMI, HARES				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2162				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/28/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/658,584

Applicant(s)

BERINGER ET AL.

Examiner

HARES JAMI

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-10,14-20,25,27,30,32-37 and 39-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-10,14-20,25,27,30,32-37 and 39-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/02/2011
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on 02/02/2011. Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 14-20, 25, 27, 30, 32-37, and 39-46 are pending in this Action. Claims 2, 4, 12, 13, 21-24, 26, 28, 31, and 38 had been previously cancelled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/02/2011 has been entered.

Remark

In response to the First Office Action, claims 1, 7, 25, 33, 36, 41, 42, 44, and 46 have been amended, claims 11 and 29 have been cancelled, and no new claim has been added.

The applicant's Interview Summary is acknowledged by the Examiner.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to newly amended claims 1 and 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection **in view of the**

new combination of Vianello, US 7,424,438 B2 and Talib et al., US 2001/0049674

A1.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter of "machine-readable **storage** medium", recited in claims 25, 27, 30, and 32-36. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5-10, 25, 27, 30, 32-37, and 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vianello, US 7,424,438 B2 issued Sep. 9, 2008 in view of Talib et al., US 2001/0049674 A1 published Dec. 6, 2001 (Talib, hereafter).

Regarding claim 1,

Vianello discloses **a method comprising:**

storing a data source of resource profiles associated with a plurality of resources, each resource the resources being at least one of a plurality of resource types (See Vianello: Fig. 2, col. 14, line 25 et seq., col. 17, lines 33-44, col.

15, line 10 et seq., and col. 22, line 11 et seq., disclosing talent and employer profiles as resource profiles);

receiving, through a user interface, one or more first attributes of a resource desired by a user; searching, using a processor, the data source of resource profiles for profiles having one or more of the first attributes (See Vianello: Fig. 4, Fig. 10, Col. 26, line 9 et seq., and col. 2, line 35 et seq., disclosing search interfaces receiving search keywords or attributes from a user and searching talent and job databases);

providing, to the user, a hit-list of resources having the one or more first attributes (See Vianello: Fig. 4, step 409 and Fig. 10, step 1008);

storing the narrowed hit-list as a collection of resources which is used for further actions or stored as a persistent collection (See Vianello: Fig. 4, step 412 and Fig. 10, step 1010).

Vianello discloses all the limitations as stated above. Vianello further discloses narrowing or refining the search results based on certain skills possessed by talents (i.e., second attributes) (see Vianello: at least col., 24, lines 34-37 and col. 43, lines 1-12). However, Vianello does not explicitly disclose **receiving one or more of second attributes of the resource through a refinement user interface; searching, using a processor, the hit-list for resources having the second attributes; providing, to the user, a narrowed hit-list of resources having the first and second attributes; automatically creating segments of the narrowed hit-list by grouping the resources according to one of a plurality of attribute dimensions; generating, for**

the user, statistics associated with the segments; receiving a selection of segments through the user interface; and providing, to the user, a subset of the narrowed hit-list based on the selected segments.

On the other hand, Talib discloses receiving a second attribute (e.g. a location) to refine and narrow the search results and providing the search results having the search attributes to a user (See Talib: at least Fig. 7-10, and [0057]). Talib further discloses automatically categorizing the narrowed search list to different categories or segments, and each category is associated with a generated number of hits (i.e. statistics), a user can select categories and a sub-categories are further provided to the user (See Talib: at least Fig. 5-10, [0047], and [0055]-[0060], and [0102]-[0105]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Vianello with Talib's teaching. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the above teachings of Talib into the teachings of Vianello in order to receive one or more of second attributes of the resource through a refinement user interface; search, using a processor, the hit-list for resources having the second attributes; provide, to the user, a narrowed hit-list of resources having the first and second attributes; automatically create segments of the narrowed hit-list by grouping the resources according to one of a plurality of attribute dimensions; generate, for the user, statistics associated with the segments; receive a selection of segments through the user interface; and provide, to the user, a subset of the narrowed hit-list based on the selected segments. The motivation for doing so would have been to increase the efficiency of the system and uncovering the right information without

forcing user to go through numerous irrelevant search results through narrowing the search result.

Regarding claim 5,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **defining the resource profiles by facets, attributes, and descriptions of the sources of the attributes** (See Vianello: Fig. 2, col. 14, line 25 et seq., col. 15, line 10 et seq., and col. 22, line 11 et seq.).

Regarding claim 6,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **generating a pattern-based user interface of a search tool from the resource profile** (See Talib: Fig. 4-6).

Regarding claim 7,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **receiving at least one selected resource type through the refinement user interface; providing a second narrowed hit-list of resources having the selected resource type from the narrowed hit-list** (See Talib: at least Fig. 5-10, [0047], and [0055]-[0060], and [0102]-[0105], selecting a category (i.e., type) through the user interface to refine the search results and providing a narrowed search result having the particular category or type);

storing the narrowed hit-list as a collection of resources for using for further actions or storing as a persistent collection (See Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10).

Regarding claim 8,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **storing the collection of resources dynamically or statically** (See Vianello: Fig. 4, Fig. 10 and col. 27, lines 30-34).

Regarding claims 9 and 10,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **aggregating the narrowed hit-list with an existing collection of resources, wherein the existing collection of resources comprises an historical listing of aggregated narrowed hit-lists** (See Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10 discloses storing of search results, therefore, every time a user save existing search results it would be added to the previous list).

Regarding claims 25, 27, 30, and 32-35,

the scope of claims 25, 27, 30, and 32-35 are substantially the same as claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, and 10, respectively. Therefore, claims 25, 27, 30, and 32-35 are rejected on the same basis as set forth for the rejections of claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, and 10, respectively.

Regarding claim 36,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **creating a layout of the segments of the narrowed hit-list by discrete values of an attribute dimension** (See Talib: at least Fig. 5-10, [0047], and [0055]-[0060], and [0102]-[0105]).

Regarding claim 37,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **the narrowed hit-list is displayed based on the resource type** (See Talib: at least Fig. 5-10, [0047], and

[0055]-[0060], and [0102]-[0105]).

Regarding claim 39,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **wherein the resource type is a person and the attributes include at least one of licenses received, papers published, languages spoken, demographic information, title in an organization, activities** (See Vianello: Fig. 2, col. 14, line 25 et seq., disclosing the resource as talents which are persons having attributes such as address, language, licenses).

Regarding claim 40,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **wherein a plurality of selected resource types are received through the refinement user interface** (See Talib: at least Fig. 5-10, [0047], and [0055]-[0060], and [0102]-[0105]).

Regarding claim 41,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **combining the stored collection of resources with a third collection of resources to create a fourth collection of resources** (Vianello discloses saving the search results which are resources (e.g. talents), and every time a user save the search result it combines the new search results with the old results, Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10).

Regarding claim 42,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **storing a narrowed collection of resources by selecting a subset of the narrowed hit-list** (See Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10).

Regarding claim 43,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **storing a narrowed collection of resources by selecting a subset of the narrowed hit-list** (See Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10, discloses saving the search results and Coiera discloses typing a name for storing the search, see Coiera: [0061]).

Regarding claim 44,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **the narrowed hit-list includes heterogeneous resources** (See Talib: at least Fig. 5-10, [0047], and [0055]-[0060], and [0102]-[0105]).

Regarding claim 45,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **wherein the facets include at least one of collaboration, qualification, interests, and activities** (See Vianello: Fig. 2, col. 14, line 25 et seq., col. 17, lines 33-44, for qualification and interests).

Regarding claim 46,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses **wherein the narrowed hit-list of resources provided from the searched hit-list** (See Talib: at least Fig. 5-10, [0047], and [0055]-[0060], and [0102]-[0105]).

Claims 3, 14-16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vianello, US 7,424,438 B2 in view of Talib et al., US 2001/0049674 A1 and further in view of Coiera et al., US 2005/0086204 A1 published Apr. 21, 2005 (Coiera, hereafter).

Regarding claim 3,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses all the limitations as stated above including **displaying, in response to a user query, resources of the hit-list for user inspection; maintaining a list of resources displayed for inspection by the user** (See Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10 displaying and storing search results). However, it does not explicitly teach **displaying a search history of search queries previously entered by a user, including a list of resources previously displayed; allowing the user to back-navigate to a search within the search history by displaying the corresponding hit-list; and displaying the list of inspected resources as the hit-list**. On the other hand, Coiera discloses using saved search queries (i.e., history) and displaying the save a list of saved search queries to a user allowing the user to back-navigate the search the saved searches and displaying search results (See Coiera: Fig. 8, [0016], and [0061]-[0062]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the teachings of the combination of Vianello and Talib with Coiera's teaching. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the above teachings of Coiera into the teachings of the combination of Vianello and Talib in order to display a search history of search queries previously entered by a user, including a list of resources previously displayed; allow the user to back-navigate to a search within the search history by displaying the corresponding hit-list; and display the list of inspected resources as the hit-list. The motivation for doing so would have been to increase the utility of the search system and saving user's time by allowing a user to select the previous keywords without spending

too much time looking for **keywords**.

Regarding claim 14,

the combination of Vianello and Talib discloses all the limitations as stated above including receiving attributes. However, it does not explicitly teach **receiving a search template from the user**. On the other hand, Coiera discloses receiving a search template from a user (See Coiera: [0004]-[0006]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the teachings of the combination of Vianello and Talib with Coiera's teaching. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the above teachings of Coiera into the teachings of the combination of Vianello and Talib in order to receive a search template from the user. The motivation for doing so would have been to increase the utility of the search system and saving user's time by allowing a user to use a base layout and pre-stored search parameters to compose a query.

Regarding claim 15,

the combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera discloses **the search template is defined by the user** (See Coiera: [0004]-[0006]).

Regarding claim 16,

the combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera discloses **the search template comprises a multi-resource query that returns resources of more than one resource type** (See Coiera: [0004]-[0006] and Fig. 9-11).

Regarding claim 18,

the combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera discloses **saving and re-using the search template can be saved and reused** (See Coiera: [0004]-[0006]).

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vianello, US 7,424,438 B2 in view of Talib et al., US 2001/0049674 A1 further in view of Coiera et al., US 2005/0086204 A1 and further in view of Nardozzi et al., US 6,636,837 B1 issued Oct. 21, 2003 (Nardozzi, hereafter).

The combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera discloses teaches all the limitations as stated above. However, it does not explicitly teach that **the search template is auto-configured based on the resource type, attributes or facets**. On the other hand, Nardozzi teaches the technique of allowing the automatic customizing of the screen for the user based on the past history or personal information of the user (see col. 7, lines 8-15, Nardozzi). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made having the teachings of Nardozzi to further modify the combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera with Nardozzi's teachings. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the technique of allowing the automatic customizing of the screen for the user based on the past history or personal information of the user (see col. 7, lines 8-15, Nardozzi) with search template of the combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera in order to auto-customized (i.e., auto-configured) the search template based on the resource type because it facilitates the searching based on the user preferences resulting in saving

time for the user.

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vianello, US 7,424,438 B2 in view of Talib et al., US 2001/0049674 A1 further in view of Coiera et al., US 2005/0086204 A1 and further in view of Jenkins, US 7,392,254 B1 issued June 24, 2008.

Regarding claim 19,

the combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera discloses teaches all the limitations as stated above. However, it does not explicitly teach that **using the hit-list to create a community, the community only including user sharing the first attributes**. On the other hand, Jenkins discloses creating a group of users (i.e., community) using the search results sharing the same keywords (See Jenkins: col. 9, lines 1-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to further modify the combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera with Jenkins's teachings. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the above teachings of Jenkins the combination of Vianello and Talib, and Coiera in order to create a community using the hit-list, the community only including user sharing the first attributes. The motivation for doing so would have been to help users involved in common interests achieve their goals by collaborating and using each other knowledge.

Regarding claims 20,

the combination of Vianello and Talib, Coiera, and Jenkins discloses **providing**

contact information in response to a user query to enable communication with resources in the community (See Jenkins: col. 9, lines 48-63).

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HARES JAMI whose telephone number is (571)270-1291. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hares Jami/
Examiner, Art Unit 2162

